UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,779	01/26/2004	Janine Louise Helms	200207303-1	9738

22879   7590   09/16/2008
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, ALLEN H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/16/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14 and 25-29* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,8-12 and 25-29* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *6,7,13 and 14* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- This office action is responsive to the following communication:

  Amendment filed on 06/06/2008.

- Claims 1-14, 25-29 are currently pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-2, 8-10, 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Kuroyanagi (US 6,597,469).

      Regarding claim 1, Kuroyanagi '469 discloses a print auditing network

(Fig. 1), comprising:

      a client (Client user 20, fig. 1) that originates a print job for printing (i.e., a

common output apparatus for print jobs requested by client users on a network

and received from the network; Col. 2, lines 42-45), the print job including

parametric data associated with the print job (i.e., a print job requested by each

client user assigned a specific print job management identification number,

instructing the composite function image forming apparatus to print out the

received print job; Col. 2, lines 53-56);

a printer (Image Input Device 200, fig. 1) in data communication (Network

10, fig. 1) with the client that is employed to print the print job (i.e., the image

input/output device comprises: second storage means for storing second

identification information for identifying a client requested a copy job by the

reader unit and the printer unit; Col. 5, lines 23-26), the print job being

transmitted from the client to the printer (i.e., a print job requested by the client

20 and an inquiry command for an output state of the print job; Col. 10, lines 61-

62);

a print job aggregator (330/340, fig. 2C) in data communication

(Input/Output Interface 310, fig. 2C) with the client and the printer (i.e., a

department manage server 300 connected to the network for managing the

number of outputs of the print and copy jobs; Col. 8, lines 50-55);

a client agent (a copy job requested by each user assigned a specific copy

job management identification number, col. 9, lines 1-5) executed in the client to

provide a first report of the parametric data associated with the print job to the

print job aggregator (i.e., the department manage server 300 receives from the

network 10 the output number managed in correspondence with the copy ID by

the copy job output number management function of the image input/output

device 200; Col. 9, lines 8-11, figs. 1, 2C);

a print agent (270, fig. 2B) executed in the printer (i.e., a departmental

copy counter table 270 is used which manages the output number of a copy job

in correspondence with each copy ID; Col. 10, lines 19-45, fig. 2B) to provide a

second report of the parametric data (ID, Monochrome and Color of Counter

Table 270, fig. 2B) associated with the print job to the print job aggregator <u>after</u>

<u>the print job is finished printing </u>(i.e., in response to a request instruction issued

from the department manage server 300, the output numbers and corresponding

copy ID's written in the departmental copy counter table 270 are transferred via

the network 10 to the department manage server 300 which calculates a total

sum of the output numbers of each print job and corresponding copy job; Col. 10,

lines 48-55), where the print job aggregator stores the first and second reports of

the parametric data in a memory (i.e., departmental counter table 340 in a

memory of the department manage server 300 for totaling and storing for each

piece of the identification information; Col. 22, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 2, Kuroyanagi '469 discloses the print auditing network

(Fig. 1), further comprising:

a print server (Print Server 100, fig. 1) in data communication (Network 10,

fig. 1) with the client (Client user 20, fig. 1), the printer (Image Input device 200,

fig. 1) and the print job aggregator (330/340 of Manage server 300, fig. 2C);

a print server agent (140, fig. 2A) executed in the print server (100, fig. 2A)

to provide a third report (Print Job 131, fig. 2A) of the parametric data (140, fig.

2A) associated with the print job to the print job aggregator (i.e., the print server

100 receives from the client 20 via the network 10 a print job requested by each

user assigned a specific print job management identification number (hereinafter

called a print ID), instructs the image input/output device 200 to output the

received print job, and manages the number of print outputs of the print job in

correspondence with the print ID of the user; Col. 9, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 8, claim 8 is the method claim of device claim 1.

Therefore, method claim 8 is rejected for the reason given in device claim 1.

Regarding claim 9, Kuroyanagi '469 discloses the method, further

comprising updating the parametric data of the print job in the printer during

printing (i.e., the output number counted for this copy job is added to the output

number registered in the departmental copy counter table 270 corresponding to

the entered copy ID to update the contents of the departmental copy counter

table 270 so as to have the addition result; Col. 10, lines 30-35, fig. 2B).

Regarding claim 10, Kuroyanagi '469 discloses the method (Fig. 1),

wherein transmitting the print job from the client (Client 20, fig. 1) to the printer

(Image Input device 200, fig. 1) further comprises:

transmitting the print job from the client to a print server that is in data

communication with the client (i.e., the print server receives from the network a print job requested by each client user assigned a specific print job management identification number; Col. 3, lines 25-30);

transmitting the print job (Print Job 131, fig. 2A) from the print server (100, fig. 2A) to the printer (I200, fig. 2B) that is in data communication (210, fig. 2B) with the print server (i.e., instructs the composite function image forming apparatus to print out the received print job, and manages the number of print outputs of the print job in correspondence with the print job management identification number; Col. 3, lines 29-32);

the method further comprising transmitting a third report of the parametric data from the print server to the print job aggregator (i.e., a print server 100 for receiving from the network 10 a print job requested by the client 20 and managing the number of outputs of the received print job; and a department manage server 300 connected to the network for managing the number of outputs of the print and copy jobs; Col. 8, lines 50-55).

Regarding claim 25, Kuroyanagi '469 discloses a print auditing network (Fig. 1), comprising:

a client (Client user 20, fig. 1) that originates a print job for printing (i.e., a common output apparatus for print jobs requested by client users on a network and received from the network; Col. 2, lines 42-45), the print job including parametric data associated with the print job (i.e., a print job requested by each client user assigned a specific print job management identification number,

instructing the composite function image forming apparatus to print out the

received print job; Col. 2, lines 53-56);

a printer (Image Input Device 200, fig. 1) in data communication (Network

10, fig. 1) with the client that is employed to print the print job (i.e., the image

input/output device comprises: second storage means for storing second

identification information for identifying a client requested a copy job by the

reader unit and the printer unit; Col. 5, lines 23-26), the print job being

transmitted from the client to the printer (i.e., a print job requested by the client

20 and an inquiry command for an output state of the print job; Col. 10, lines 61-

62);

a print job aggregator (330/340, fig. 2C) in data communication

(Input/Output Interface 310, fig. 2C) with the client and the printer (i.e., a

department manage server 300 connected to the network for managing the

number of outputs of the print and copy jobs; Col. 8, lines 50-55);

means (a copy job requested by each user assigned a specific copy job

management identification number, col. 9, lines 1-5) in the client for providing a

first report of the parametric data associated with the print job to the print job

aggregator (i.e., the department manage server 300 receives from the network

10 the output number managed in correspondence with the copy ID by the copy

job output number management function of the image input/output device 200;

Col. 9, lines 8-11, figs. 1, 2C);

means (270, fig. 2B) in the printer (i.e., a departmental copy counter table

270 is used which manages the output number of a copy job in correspondence

with each copy ID; Col. 10, lines 19-45, fig. 2B) for providing a second report of

the parametric data (ID, Monochrome and Color of Counter Table 270, fig. 2B)

associated with the print job to the print job aggregator after the print job is

finished printing (i.e., in response to a request instruction issued from the

department manage server 300, the output numbers and corresponding copy

ID's written in the departmental copy counter table 270 are transferred via the

network 10 to the department manage server 300 which calculates a total sum of

the output numbers of each print job and corresponding copy job; Col. 10, lines

48-55), where the print job aggregator stores the first and second reports of the

parametric data in a memory (i.e., departmental counter table 340 in a memory of

the department manage server 300 for totaling and storing for each piece of the

identification information; Col. 22, lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 26, Kuroyanagi '469 discloses the print auditing network

(Fig. 1), further comprising:

a print server (Print Server 100, fig. 1) in data communication (Network 10,

fig. 1) with the client (Client user 20, fig. 1), the printer and the print job

aggregator (330/340 of Manage server 300, fig. 2C);

means (140, fig. 2A) in the print server (100, fig. 2A) for providing a third

report (Print Job 131, fig. 2A) of the parametric data (140, fig. 2A) associated with

the print job to the print job aggregator (i.e., the print server 100 receives from

the client 20 via the network 10 a print job requested by each user assigned a

specific print job management identification number (hereinafter called a print

ID), instructs the image input/output device 200 to output the received print job,

and manages the number of print outputs of the print job in correspondence with

the print ID of the user; Col. 9, lines 1-7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

5.   Claims 3-4, 11, 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kuroyanagi (US 6,597,469) in view of Ferlitsch (US

2003/0090705).

Regarding claim 3, Kuroyanagi '469 does not explicitly show the print

auditing network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated

with the print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art

as evidenced by Ferlitsch '705. In particular, Ferlitsch '705 teaches the print

auditing network (56, fig. 2), wherein the parametric data (PJL Print Job Header

140b, fig. 3D) is included in a header associated with the print job (the spool data

contains a sequence of print job commands 140 (e.g. in a PJL, PCL, Postscript,

or other format) that describe the overall sheet assembly selections or requirements of the print job; Page 5, paragraph [0060], fig. 3D).

In view of the above, having the system of Kuroyanagi and then given the well-established teaching of Ferlitsch, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Kuroyanagi as taught by Ferlitsch to include: The print auditing network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated with the print job, since Ferlitsch stated on page 1, paragraph [0005] that such a modification would ensure the emergence of software and hardware components of computer systems, users are able to employ the computer systems to perform a variety of tasks.

Regarding claim 4, Kuroyanagi '469 does not explicitly show the print auditing network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated with the print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Ferlitsch '705. In particular, Ferlitsch '705 teaches the print auditing network (56, fig. 2), wherein the parametric data (PJL Print Job Header 140b, fig. 3D) is included in a header associated with the print job (the spool data contains a sequence of print job commands 140 (e.g. in a PJL, PCL, Postscript, or other format) that describe the overall sheet assembly selections or requirements of the print job; Page 5, paragraph [0060], fig. 3D).

In view of the above, having the system of Kuroyanagi and then given the well-established teaching of Ferlitsch, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Kuroyanagi as taught by Ferlitsch to include: The print auditing network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated with the print job, since Ferlitsch stated on page 1, paragraph [0005] that such a modification would ensure the emergence of software and hardware components of computer systems, users are able to employ the computer systems to perform a variety of tasks.

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 is the method claim of device claim 3. Therefore, method claim 11 is rejected for the reason given in device claim 3.

Regarding claim 27, Kuroyanagi '469 does not explicitly show the print auditing network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated with the print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Ferlitsch '705. In particular, Ferlitsch '705 teaches the print auditing network (56, fig. 2), wherein the parametric data (PJL Print Job Header 140b, fig. 3D) is included in a header associated with the print job (the spool data contains a sequence of print job commands 140 (e.g. in a PJL, PCL, Postscript, or other format) that describe the overall sheet assembly selections or requirements of the print job; Page 5, paragraph [0060], fig. 3D).

In view of the above, having the system of Kuroyanagi and then given the well-established teaching of Ferlitsch, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Kuroyanagi as taught by Ferlitsch to include: The print auditing network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated with the print job, since Ferlitsch stated on page 1, paragraph [0005] that such a modification would ensure the emergence of software and hardware components of computer systems, users are able to employ the computer systems to perform a variety of tasks.

Regarding claim 28, Kuroyanagi '469 does not explicitly show the print auditing network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated with the print job.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitation is well known in the art as evidenced by Ferlitsch '705. In particular, Ferlitsch '705 teaches the print auditing network (56, fig. 2), wherein the parametric data (PJL Print Job Header 140b, fig. 3D) is included in a header associated with the print job (the spool data contains a sequence of print job commands 140 (e.g. in a PJL, PCL, Postscript, or other format) that describe the overall sheet assembly selections or requirements of the print job; See page 5, paragraph [0060], fig. 3D).

In view of the above, having the system of Kuroyanagi and then given the well-established teaching of Ferlitsch, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the

system of Kuroyanagi as taught by Ferlitsch to include: The print auditing

network, wherein the parametric data is included in a header associated with the

print job, since Ferlitsch stated on page 1, paragraph [0005] that such a

modification would ensure the emergence of software and hardware components

of computer systems, users are able to employ the computer systems to perform

a variety of tasks.

6.   Claims 5, 12, 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Kuroyanagi (US 6,597,469) in view of Ferlitsch (US

2003/0090705), and further in view of Herbach et al. (US 2005/0097441).

        Regarding claim 5, the combination of Kuroyanagi '469 and Ferlitsch '705

does not explicitly show the print auditing network, wherein a globally unique

identifier is associated with each of the first, second, and third reports of the

parametric data and the globally unique identifier is the same in the first, second

and third reports.

        However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the

art as evidenced by Herbach '441. In particular, Herbach '441 teaches the print

auditing network (Network 100, fig. 1), wherein a globally unique identifier is

associated with each of the first, second, and third reports of the parametric data

(i.e., allocation of document tickets, each document that is secured on the server

can be given a ticket with a GUID (global unique identifier); Page 10, paragraph

[0104]) and the globally unique identifier is the same in the first, second and third

reports (i.e., an authentication procedure can even be changed between sequential actions on a document, and thus a new request 350 can result in a new authentication process 315 being delivered for the same action to be performed on an already delivered document; Page 5, paragraph [0062], fig. 3).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Kuroyanagi and Ferlitsch and then given the well-established teaching of Herbach, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Kuroyanagi and Ferlitsch as taught by Herbach to include: the print auditing network, wherein a globally unique identifier is associated with each of the first, second, and third reports of the parametric data and the globally unique identifier is the same in the first, second and third reports, since Herbach stated on page 1, paragraph [0002] that such a modification would ensure providing persistent protection for documents by requiring the server to be contacted before a secured document can be opened.

Regarding claim 12, claim 12 is the method claim of device claim 5. Therefore, method claim 12 is rejected for the reason given in device claim 5.

Regarding claim 29, the combination of Kuroyanagi '469 and Ferlitsch '705 does not explicitly show the print auditing network, wherein a globally unique identifier is associated with each of the first, second, and third reports of the parametric data and the globally unique identifier is the same in the first, second and third reports.

However, the above-mentioned claimed limitations are well known in the art as evidenced by Herbach '441. In particular, Herbach '441 teaches the print auditing network (Network 100, fig. 1), wherein a globally unique identifier is associated with each of the first, second, and third reports of the parametric data (i.e., allocation of document tickets, each document that is secured on the server can be given a ticket with a GUID (global unique identifier); Page 10, paragraph [0104]) and the globally unique identifier is the same in the first, second and third reports (i.e., an authentication procedure can even be changed between sequential actions on a document, and thus a new request 350 can result in a new authentication process 315 being delivered for the same action to be performed on an already delivered document; Page 5, paragraph [0062], fig. 3).

In view of the above, having the combination system of Kuroyanagi and Ferlitsch and then given the well-established teaching of Herbach, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the system of Kuroyanagi and Ferlitsch as taught by Herbach to include: the print auditing network, wherein a globally unique identifier is associated with each of the first, second, and third reports of the parametric data and the globally unique identifier is the same in the first, second and third reports, since Herbach stated on page 1, paragraph [0002] that such a modification would ensure providing persistent protection for documents by requiring the server to be contacted before a secured document can be opened.

7.   Claims 6-7, 13-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected

base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all

of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable

subject matter:

Regarding claim 6, the prior art of the record fails to show the print

auditing network, wherein:

the client agent provides the first report of the parametric data to the print

job aggregator by transmitting a copy of the header of the print job to the print job

aggregator before the print job is transmitted from the client to the print server;

the print server agent provides the third report of the parametric data to

the print job aggregator by transmitting a copy of the header to the print job

aggregator before the print job is transmitted to the printer;

the printer agent provides the second report of the parametric data to the

print job aggregator by transmitting the header to the print job aggregator after

the print job is finished printing.

Regarding claim 7, the claim is allowable for the reasons given in claim 6.

Regarding claim 13, the prior art of the record fails to show the method,

wherein:

the transmitting of the first report of the parametric data from the client to

the print job aggregator further comprises transmitting a copy of the header of the

print job from the client to the print job aggregator; and

the transmitting of the third report of the parametric data from the print

server to the print job aggregator further comprises transmitting a copy of the

header of the print job from the print server to the print job aggregator; and

the transmitting of the second report of the parametric data from the

printer to the print job aggregator further comprises transmitting a copy of the

header of the print job to the print job aggregator.

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Shapiro et al. (US 2005/0097061) discloses offline access in a document

control system.

Mastie et al. (US 6,373,585) discloses load balancing for processing a

queue of print jobs.

Stewart et al. (2004/0057075) discloses system, method and recordable

medium for printing services over a network.

9.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to ALLEN H. NGUYEN whose telephone

number is (571)270-1229. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from

9:00 AM-6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, King Poon can be reached on (571)-272-7440. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/King Y. Poon/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Allen H Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625